

each other and try to create publicity. Certainly that is worthy of a prison sentence, to overthrow the people's democratic dictatorship, sabotage the Socialist system, and separate the country.

Wei Jingsheng will be in jail for another 14 years, and the response from the Clinton administration has been deafening. One of our Democratic colleagues said yesterday, "I think the administration policy is a dismal failure in every respect, and I think the sentence is a slap in the face." The New York Times notes today that the Clinton administration, while criticizing China, stopped conspicuously short of threatening specific retaliatory action.

Mr. Speaker, even our Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights said only, "We urge the Chinese authorities to show clemency." Clemency, colleagues, is due someone who is guilty. Wei Jingsheng is innocent, he is an innocent man wrongly charged, and this body, Democrats and Republicans alike, should band together in his support.

TREATING OUR FELLOW MEMBERS WITH RESPECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk very briefly about something that is concerning me very deeply, especially in light of some of the debate or lack of debate that took place in this Chamber last night on the Bosnian question.

President Bush referred to a growing mood on Capitol Hill as a climate of ugliness, and President Thomas Jefferson talked about, when he wrote the manual that we all read as new Members of Congress and try to refresh our memories about the rules of civility and comity in this body; we all read Thomas Jefferson's words, and he stated, and I quote:

It is very material that order, decency and regularity be preserved in a dignified public body.

Mr. Speaker, I think that as the debate spirals downward at times and people resort to the temptation of name-calling, and finger-pointing, and fisticuffs rather than camaraderie, and civility, and community, that we not only hurt bipartisanship in this body now and in the future, but I think we tear at the fabric of what Americans deeply respect about this institution and what they want us to do today, and that is to work together to solve some of our problems in a bipartisan way on the budget, on making Congress work more efficiently and effectively, of downsizing Government, particularly committees and subcommittees here in this body, and that we can do it in a civil manner, being civil to one another.

My very first vote, Mr. Speaker, 4½ years ago as a new Member of Congress was on the Persian Gulf, and I was in-

ducted into this body with such a deep sense of awe and respect not because George Washington's picture is in this body, not because In God We Trust is above the flag here in this Chamber, but because Members treat each other with respect, and although we had disagreement on the timing of going to war, everybody respected the differences in opinion, and everybody was a patriot.

Last night's debate did not include that kind of respect, and I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, on a quote from Speaker Joe Cannon who once said:

It is true we engage in fierce combat, we are often intense partisans, sometimes we are unfair, not infrequently unjust, brutal at times, and yet I venture to say, taken as a whole the House is sound at heart. Nowhere else will you find such a ready appreciation of merit and character. In few gatherings in equal size is there so little jealousy and envy.

I think the first part of that statement is very true, Mr. Speaker. We do have fierce partisanship at times, but we should always have the nature and character of civility which is reflected in our rules come to the foremost, be held at the highest respect and esteem for all Members, and that we continue to work in a bipartisan way for what is best for the American people.

□ 1415

FUNDING AMERICA'S DEFENSE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIM). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER]. I think he was right on the ball. I do not necessarily agree with the strategy or the tactics used by the House, and I probably would have supported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] if it had—I did not fight to get that unanimous consent removed.

As I stated in my opening remarks last night, I thought all the Members across the board had good intentions in this thing. I would support that. I would also tell my friend that quite often when we sit on this side of the aisle, we feel that there is a lot of misinformation on Medicare, that there are no cuts and different things, and a different way to get to education, and it is difficult to come to those terms sometimes when you are getting slammed down on the ground all the time. I would work, and I know the gentleman does, and I know how he works, and I know that he himself would do that. The problem sometimes is with leadership. I would work with the gentleman.

Let me go to the issue that I want to talk about.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would say, as

classmates and people who serve on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, you and I do work in a bipartisan way on many occasions, and I have a great amount of respect for you. When we had the Persian Gulf debate, and as a former war hero, you have added a great deal to the debate we have had on military matters.

I just have a deep, deep regret and a heavy heart when we have the kind of lack of civility that took place in the body last night on a unanimous-consent motion, on a resolution supporting not the mission—with which I disagree—in Bosnia, but the confidence in our troops and the support for our troops, which I wholly agree with. I would hope that we could have agreed to that unanimous consent last night.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to talk about a little today, and I do not have time to do it fully, and it is not on a partisan issue, is that many of us voted last night on our consciences, and feeling that we were doing the best thing for our troops overseas. My concern, as I stated, is not the votes last night, Mr. Speaker. My concern is what comes in the future, that we hear people say they want to support the troops, they want to make sure that they do not come back in body bags; that they come back.

There are legitimate issues on how much we should spend for defense and how much not. But remember when the President ran in his campaign, he said a \$50 billion defense cut would put us into a hollow force, and then in his first tax bill would put us at a \$177 billion defense deficit, would decrease defense.

Because of some of the different environments we go to in the world, with Haiti and Somalia, the different areas, and I am not going to go through the negative of those, but it has put us even further below what the requirements of defense are. GAO has said we are \$200 billion below the bottoms-up review. The bottoms-up review was, remember, drafted by then-Secretary Les Aspin and the President to see what our needs would be to be able to fight two conflicts, and the minimum we would need to be able to do that. When you are \$200 billion below that, then it tells you that you need to put some more dollars into national security for this country.

Some people on the debate tomorrow will say that there is more in this Defense authorization bill than the President asked for. This is true. But as I take a look, let me give you a couple of examples.

The F-15 Strike Eagle, the Air Force has not bought a single airplane in 3 years because of the budget. They are using the F-15 Strike Eagles in Bosnia today, out of Italy and other places. They are also using the F-16. The Navy